

had all been directed to Capital Cable, it is true. In view of the President's statement that "we are willing to comply" a Commission aid said he "assumed" FCC would ask the trustees for it. Within a week Capital Cable had turned the document over to FCC.

Mr. Johnson was also asked how he felt about the ethics of high Government officials having interest in Government-regulated industries such as television. He replied that he had no interest in Government-regulated industries and never had. He said "all of that stock has been placed in trust, as has been the practice with other Presidents." and "I see no conflict in any way."

This was in part an evasive reply taking advantage of the wording of the question. The real question is what he thinks of the ethics involved when the fortune of the President's family is in an industry regulated by Government Commissioners over whom the President holds the power of appointment. It was also in part a reply drawing a parallel which the facts do not support. Mrs. Johnson trusted her stock with three old family friends. This is quite a far cry from the drastic steps taken by Mr. Johnson's two predecessors to avoid so much as an appearance of conflict between public duty and private gain.

The late President Kennedy sold all his corporate stocks and bonds and put the proceeds into Federal, State and municipal bonds. President Eisenhower put his corporate securities in trust under terms which prevented him from knowing how the funds were managed or in what securities they were reinvested, and also prevented his subordinates in Government from knowing what companies were represented.

For the sake of the Presidency and of Mr. Johnson's history in it, we hope he will decide to deal firmly with the duality which is blighting the FCC.

Polish Constitution Day

SPEECH

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1964

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, the United States has many responsibilities. We presently carry the heaviest peacetime burden and are more involved in more places than any other country in history. Most of the time our attention is fixed on the dramatic or the threatening world events—jungle wars, revolutions, international conferences. But we should not overlook the many important cares in the world not so dramatic or so threatening. Americans must have room for all problems and a thought for all people. For this reason we often speak in Congress about the captive nations of Eastern Europe.

They now appear to be securely in Communist control. But occasionally a stirring escape through the Berlin wall, a riot in Budapest, a political refugee, remind us that communism was imposed on these many little countries by force. It is incompatible with liberal, Christian ideals of individual liberty and brotherly love which formed the cultural backbone of Europe, East and West, for centuries.

The small band of insatiable despots who have achieved tyranny out of chaos

in Russia, have been assiduously expanding that tyranny for nearly 50 years. But even now they must know that they cannot win. They are themselves being forced to change by confronting the superior virtue of Western thought. But no matter how rapid this process, nor how gratifying its character, the terrible injustices of the days of Communist expansion can never be removed.

May 3 is the anniversary of the Polish Constitution of 1791, one of the hopeful liberal documents of the 18th century which was destroyed in the imperial wars of that age. The occasion brings to our attention one of the long-suffering nations which is too often overlooked because it is not presently seething. But Poland is still not free. Until it is, Americans bear the burden of sending words of encouragement to Poland and transmitting the latest ideas of democracy. We do this through the Voice of America and Radio Free Europe.

As we remember Polish Constitution Day this year, let us resolve not only to think of the dramatic or threatening. Let us also think of the humanitarian, the needs of the captive peoples behind the Iron Curtain.

The Prayer Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 4, 1964

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, as the wave of testimony has swept through the Judiciary Committee on the various proposals for a prayer amendment, as I review the barrage of mail I have received from constituents on this important subject, as I survey the public comments of my colleagues here on the floor of Congress and elsewhere on the matter, I cannot but recall an incident which sharply reflects my own judgment about the central conflict involved in the considerations.

I was a dinner guest at the home of a member of a foreign embassy staff, whose charming wife was, as he, a Moslem. She was recounting her childhood and young adult experience in the Christian missionary schools established in her land by faiths in America. It developed that almost all of her schooling, including college, had been under the auspices of Christian church activities. A wife of an American Ambassador present concluded after her recital—"I suppose they made a Christian of you in the process."

"No," the hostess quickly said, "but they did make me a better Moslem."

This exchange had deep meaning for me. I recalled that my own mother who had a deep conviction in her own faith had urged all six of her children to go to church somewhere whatever the circumstances in which they found themselves and whether or not our own sect had services available or not.

"I never knew anyone to be hurt from going to church" she said "and whatever

you learn will more than likely be of help."

Now, Mr. Speaker, we hear a great deal of concern expressed by two opposing extremes over religious observances in public places including schools. In my view both sides obscure the common-sense of the issues. The Supreme Court has stated that an officially designated prayer established by a governmental body or one of its agencies is an infraction of the limitations set forth in the Constitution, and I believe that determination is a correct one.

There are zealous persons who go on to declare that any religious observations are an infraction of their rights to practice their particular brand of religion or their denial of all religion. Such a position is an affront to common-sense and contrary to experience. Tolerantly applied expressions or lessons surrounding the basic tenants of Christianity can only make better Buddhist, Jews, atheists or whatever. Nor should the exchange of knowledge of the basic expressions or concepts of other religions be denied young Christians for it is equally true it could prove to make them better Christians.

It is no different in this matter of prayer and Bible reading than it is in the conflict over teaching the basic tenets of communism or nazism. It depends on whether there is an attitude and presentation as indoctrination or an attitude and presentation of enlightenment. I would be greatly disappointed if the Supreme Court in any of its pronouncements would state or could be interpreted as saying that the great moral and spiritual values of the past were not available to our youngsters everywhere and from whatever religious background to make of them better and more enlightened pursuers of whatever sect or group with which they ultimately freely choose to associate.

I am repelled equally from the position of those who react so violently as to justify sacrificing the division of church and state which has served so well all these years. The containment of the divergence of attitude and conviction in an area of such emotional involvement would hardly be possible in any other legal environment.

May we hope, Mr. Speaker, that commonsense will prevail on both sides. Keep us from rationalizations however purely motivated or logically conceived which propel us to the extremes in this argument. Let tolerance above the heated harangue bring balance back to a belabored people.

The Baker Noninvestigation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 4, 1964

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Roscoe Drummond, in his column published by the Washington Post on Mon-

May 4
Cuba

day, May 4, sets forth what a majority of our people are thinking, namely that the Senate Rules Committee did what they could to prove that the committee was a noninvestigating committee, and they went out of their way to prevent material evidence from getting into the record.

His column follows:

NO PROGRESS: THE BAKER NONINVESTIGATION
(By Roscoe Drummond)

The Democratic majority of the Senate noninvestigating committee is showing positive genius in finding ways to prevent itself from getting the evidence in the Bobby Baker case.

I don't mean that the Senate Rules Committee has been idle in its noninvestigation. It hasn't. It has worked arduous hours thinking up ways not to do its work.

It has been quick and alert. When its principal potential witness—Bobby Baker himself—closed one door in its face, the Democratic majority of the committee knew exactly what to do. At its own initiative it closed all the other doors of profitable inquiry and went right back to its work of not getting the facts.

Most Washington correspondents are convinced that the committee closed down its noninvestigation "just in the nick of time," that is, before it found anything embarrassing to anybody in the halls of Congress.

The theory must be that Baker, who used his position as secretary of the Senate Democrats to accomplish we-know-not-what, operated with a dead telephone in an empty office.

And if he didn't, the Senate Rules Committee is apparently determined not to find out.

When he was first solicited for testimony, Bobby Baker let it be known that he was very busy "writing a book." Some hands in the Senate went to furrowed brows. "Is Bobby writing about me?" they worried.

And then when he was finally subpoenaed, he took the fifth amendment when he was asked to give his name.

Whereupon the Democratic majority of the noninvestigating committee were unanimously confident that there were no other ways of finding out to whom, for whom, and with whom he had been doing things in the Senate for so many years.

Obviously what the people want to know, need to know, and have the right to know is how Baker was able to manipulate government in the interests of himself and his friends. To what extent and in what ways had individual Senators and the Senate as a whole been involved as pawns, partners or otherwise in the Baker operations?

These are good questions. And there are others. Surely such questions as these should be addressed to the 100 U.S. Senators:

What, if any, business or financial dealings did you have with Bobby Baker?

Did Bobby Baker ever give you, get for you, offer you or offer to get for you any campaign contributions—and with conditions attached? (One Senator, FRANK E. Moss, of Utah, disclosed that he received an offer of campaign funds from Baker and rejected the money because it was made conditional upon his support of the oil-depletion allowance.)

Did Baker offer any other U.S. Senators help to make up campaign deficits through gifts, purchase of tickets or otherwise, any retainer or employment, any preferment in committee assignment, anything of value?

Bobby Baker can, of course, use the fifth amendment to refuse to tell the Rules Committee about his dealings with Senators, but can 100 U.S. Senators take the fifth amendment if they are asked the same questions?

The Democratic majority of the Senate Rules Committee may have reached the peak of its noninvestigation when it refused even to allow Senator CLIFFORD P. CASE, of New

Jersey, to appear before it to advocate this line of inquiry.

It is true that no Senate committee has the power to subpoena a U.S. Senator, but Senators can be asked the questions in one way or another.

It is true that they can't be compelled to answer. But even their nonanswers would be revealing.

The Study Club of Lanham

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLTON R. SICKLES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 4, 1964

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, one of the basic strengths of our American society results from the willingness of our citizens to work together voluntarily on the local level to improve the communities in which they live. Typical of this important characteristic is the work of the Study Club of Lanham. The Study Club of Lanham celebrated its golden anniversary on Wednesday, April 15, 1964, marking 50 years of service to the community. The motto of the club, taken from Tennyson is: "Self-Knowledge, Self-Control, Self-Reverence; These Three, Lead Life to Sovereign Power." The club's flower is the daisy, the club's goal is "unity in the promotion of education, community work and international Relations."

Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit for the RECORD a list of the members of the Golden Anniversary Committee of the Lanham Study Club, the club's officers for 1964, and the highlights of 50 years of the club's actions:

HIGHLIGHTS OF 50 YEARS OF ACTION

Education: Scholarships; Lanham school construction and school lunches; chartered Future Teachers of America at Bladensburg Senior High School; Maryland Hall of Records tour; Lanham play center (kindergarten); "Teacher of the Year" Awards.

Libraries and the arts: Sponsored Lanham school library; sponsored Lanham play center library; sponsored Lanham lending library; painting group; music group.

Beautification of Lanham: Living community Christmas tree and lighted sign; distributed 300 red bud trees; distributed 100 flowering crabapple trees; garden group.

Community service: World War I—Red Cross work and adopted a war orphan; memorials—from birdbath to wheelchair; cancer collection at each monthly meeting; Lanham road marker; World War II—civil defense first aid stations set up and staffed; monthly sewing at Prince Georges General Hospital; sponsored recent organization of 20th district civil defense unit.

GOLDEN ANNIVERSARY COMMITTEE

Marie Essex, chairman; Margaret Cook, vice chairman; Gertrude Chapman, Helen Downes, Annie Mallonee, Alice Martin, Lavenia McGinn, Grace Owen.

OFFICERS—1964

Alice Martin, president; Helen Downes, vice president; Ethel Downes, treasurer; Elva Martin, recording secretary; Elizabeth Patton, corresponding secretary; Clarice Wadleigh, director; editor, sixth district for the Maryland Clubwoman, Marie Essex; sixth district, religion and family life division, Kay Newland; sixth district, resolutions committee, Helen Downes.

Not Really So Rosy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 4, 1964

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Portland Oregonian, Wednesday, April 22, 1964:

NOT REALLY SO ROSY

(By Herbert Lundy)

WASHINGTON.—It is possible to disagree with the repeated assurances of the Johnson administration's highest spokesmen, including the President, that despite certain irritations our foreign situation looks a lot better than it usually does.

The cliff-hanger in Laos, a little country nobody really wants, may be resolved without harm to the U.S. position. But even if that happens, there is no assurance that the Ho Chi Minh trail from North Vietnam to South Vietnam, via Laos, can be cut off.

Improvement of the anti-Communist war in South Vietnam now hinges on the ability of Gen. Nguyen Khanh, the latest topman, to convince the people that they should support him rather than the Vietcong. U.S. diplomats think he may be the answer. Also, they discount talk of another coup as Communist inspired. But the unhappy thought is always present of an assassin's bullet. If Khanh were killed or overthrown, after the recent unanimous selection of him—from McNamara to Rusk—as Vietnam's savior, that would be about it.

But one gathers that administration officials are worrying more, while saying less, about Fidel Castro. Uncle Sam crawled out on a limb in 1962, after the nuclear confrontation with the Soviet Union, when President Kennedy backed down on the agreement he had with Khrushchev for at-site inspection of missile placements in Cuba. Mikoyan couldn't get Castro to agree to that. So President Kennedy accepted as an alternative unhindered aerial reconnaissance.

Now, the administration says the Russians soon will have all their troops out of Cuba except for some technicians and training units. Washington hopes the Russians won't turn over to the Cubans they have trained the SAM missiles capable of shooting down even high-altitude reconnaissance planes like the U-2. But the Cubans talk the other way.

Fidel himself kicked off the new crisis by protesting the violation of Cuban territory by U.S. overflights. The State Department warned Castro that the United States will continue to overfly to make sure that long-range missiles are not reintroduced. The use of Soviet missiles against American reconnaissance planes would create a "highly dangerous situation," said the United States.

Cuba's foreign minister, Raul Roa, replied with a statement that the United States must take full responsibility for future violation of Cuban sovereignty by invading Cuban air space and "ignoring international law."

Thus, the United States must confront a situation brought about by the late President Kennedy's backdown after he forced Khrushchev to withdraw his missiles from Cuba. We do not have an international leg to stand on if we continue to overfly Cuba. But in the primary interest of U.S. security, we have no choice except to continue reconnaissance.

The galling fact is that now the United States must depend upon Premier Khrushchev to demonstrate his love for peace and his respect for capitalist America by restrain-

1964

ing Castro. There is historical evidence to support the idea that Khrushchev is not going to do that for us, assuming that he has the power, without getting a more important concession in another part of the world.

If Castro shoots down an American plane over Cuba, what do we do then? And if we do it, what will the Soviet Union do, inasmuch as it has more or less guaranteed to defend Cuba against U.S. armed attack? Somehow, one is reluctant to accept at face value the extreme optimism of the Johnson administration.

Civil Rights Bill—Title I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 4, 1964

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, much has been written and will be written concerning the civil rights bill. Unfortunately, not all of what has been written has aided in the deliberations of this vitally important bill. Some of the articles have been deliberately distorted, while others do not clearly state the facts. Starting today, the New York Times will publish a series of editorials which will discuss each title of the bill. I wish to bring to the attention of all my colleagues these editorials which certainly should aid in the understanding of the bill and contribute to its passage as soon as possible.

The editorial for today follows:

[From the New York Times, May 4, 1964]

CIVIL RIGHTS—I

Senate supporters of the civil rights bill plan to move this month to force an end of the southern filibuster. The importance of this safeguard for basic American rights, already passed with overwhelming bipartisan backing in the House, makes it essential that it be brought to a Senate vote swiftly. We have repeatedly expressed our own strong support for the measure. However, the long congressional debate has been more successful in befogging than in clarifying the bill's provisions. In a series of editorials we intend to explain point-by-point why we consider its prompt passage imperative.

The most basic of all rights in a democracy, the right to vote, is the subject of title I. That Congress should still be obliged to seek ways to protect that right for all citizens, a century after the 15th amendment forbade the States to deny or abridge it on account of race, is a disgrace. Yet the undeniable facts of discrimination make it urgent for Congress to take further action now.

Registrars in Mississippi, Louisiana, Alabama, and some other rural areas of the South are cynical in the obstacles they put in the way of Negroes desiring to register. A college graduate is flunked because he does not pronounce a word or "interpret" some obscure constitutional provision to the registrar's satisfaction. Meanwhile, illiterate whites are registered.

The Justice Department, under the Civil Rights Acts of 1957 and 1960, has been working vigorously in recent years to end such discrimination. But the case-by-case process is slow, and some Federal judges—both Eisenhower and the Kennedy appointees—have dragged their feet.

The thrust of title I in the pending bill is to speed up the process of enfranchise-

ment. District courts of three judges instead of one could be appointed, with precedence for voting cases on the calendar. Registrars would be specifically forbidden to apply different standards to different citizens, to deny registration because of trivial errors or to use subjective oral "tests." Anyone who had finished six grades of schooling would be presumed sufficiently literate for voting purposes unless the State showed otherwise.

Such definite standards should simplify voting suits. The charge that they invade the right of the States to establish voting qualifications is baseless. All they do is to make sure that State rules are applied fairly to all—not, as the Supreme Court has said, with an evil eye and an unequal hand.

Indeed, the real question about title I is whether it goes far enough. The dismaying facts are that only 5 percent of Negroes in Mississippi are able to vote and that many southern counties with Negro majorities have almost no Negro voters. Such facts really warrant more drastic Federal supervision of the registration process than this legislation provides.

The proposed title is a moderate step, an attempt to use the traditional process of the courts and encourage local reform. Taken in conjunction with the bill's other key provisions, it should do much to make concrete the voting rights Negroes supposedly were guaranteed a hundred years ago.

Polish Constitution Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 4, 1964

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, dauntless and daring fighters for their human freedoms, the Poles are a gifted, resourceful, and industrious people. In the course of their turbulent history they have contributed to mankind great masters of art, science, and statecraft. Their liberal and democratic Constitution, drafted, adopted, and promulgated on May 3, 1791, quite clearly illustrates their skill in the field of government and diplomacy.

That Constitution is a veritable landmark in the progressive process of evolving a constitutional form of government, in an orderly and democratic way. By that historic document the Poles accomplished peacefully what many other people had attempted to accomplish by revolution and bloodshed. In this constitution the king's autocratic and unlimited powers were sharply reduced, and a constitutional government was established with a responsible cabinet. The upper chamber lost some of its powers, while the lower and popularly elected chamber gained considerable legislative power. Religious liberty was guaranteed, and the peasants were taken under the protection of the law. Townsman recovered their judicial autonomy, and received a number of political rights. For all these and other liberal, progressive features the Constitution of 1791 was hailed as a great advance step in the right direction. Unfortunately, patriotic Poles who framed and enacted the Constitution into law, were not given the chance to see it work. Soon after its pro-

mulgation, Poland was attacked and overrun, and finally partitioned among its three greedy neighbors. But the spirit of freedom and progress embodied in that Constitution did not die. Today, on the 173d anniversary observance of the adoption of that Constitution, they still cling to the lofty ideals embodied in their Constitution of 1791.

Polish Constitution Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 4, 1964

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, as we in the United States know so well, the development of and the functioning of government must be within the confines of constitutional guidelines and precepts. Thus are guaranteed the rights of the individual citizens and thus is assured government by the people and for the people.

Soon after the adoption of the Constitution of the United States, the citizens of Poland adopted a constitution. The year was 1791. Poland had already undergone a partition at the hands of her three powerful neighbors—Austria, Prussia, and Russia. In order to forestall further encroachments, certain liberal leaders of Poland, imbued with genuine democratic ideas, had been working on a new constitution. It is that document, adopted in May of 1791 whose anniversary is being observed. That historic document seemed at the time a true bill of rights for the Polish nation. By that constitution a government of limited monarchy was established with definite ministerial responsibility. The electorate of the parliament was considerably enlarged, and numerous privileges formerly enjoyed by the small upper classes alone were made available to other classes. Certain rights of the peasantry were restored and the peasants were brought under the protection of the law. Even more important, freedom of conscience was guaranteed, and absolute religious toleration was established.

Today, so many years after that epochal event and after so many advances in all phases of democracy, this document may seem somewhat outdated, but nevertheless, it is regarded as a forerunner of later liberal constitutions, particularly in central and Eastern Europe. In many respects it was a pioneering document and therein may be found its real significance.

Unfortunately for the Poles and their friends abroad, there was little chance to put its provisions into operation. Soon Poland was again partitioned by her implacable and powerful neighbors, and is no longer a free and independent and sovereign country. Even so, all Poles regarded, and still regard, this document as a landmark in their history.

I am honored to join in the participation of the 173d anniversary celebration

May 4

A2242

of Polish Constitution Day. I have visited Poland on several occasions in recent years and I know that the principals embodied in that great document are cherished today even though a foreign nation dominates that country and the people are denied the rights that were once guaranteed them.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. M. G. (GENE) SNYDER
OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 4, 1964

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission heretofore granted, I submit for printing in the Appendix of the Record my May 1 report to the people of my district. I trust that the Members and other readers will find it interesting and worthwhile:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman M. G. "GENE" SNYDER,
Third District, Kentucky, May 1, 1964)

DEAR FRIEND: The Nation was saddened by the death of General of the Army Douglas MacArthur. He exemplified not only the glory and tradition of our Army, but the courage and valor of all our troops in all our wars. His example stirred men far beyond the limits of the military. His wisdom and foresight will be recorded by all honest historians. Of MacArthur, it can be truly said that he called forth the best in men.

GENERAL DOUGLAS MACARTHUR—1880-1964

Career highlights—Important chronological events in MacArthur's career:
Commissioned at West Point, a second lieutenant in the Corps of Engineers, June 11, 1903.

Became a colonel of infantry August 5, 1917, and a month later chief of staff of the 42d Division.

Appointed Superintendent of the U.S. Military Academy June 12, 1919; married Mrs. Henrietta Louise Cromwell Brooks (a divorcee) at Palm Beach while he was a major general in 1922.

Elected president of the U.S. Olympic Committee in 1928.

Quelled Bonus Expeditionary Force riots and march on Washington, D.C., July, 1932.

Appointed field marshal of the Philippine Army, June 1936, by President Roosevelt.

Married Miss Jean Faircloth of Tennessee, after having been divorced in New York, 1937.

Transferred Philippines' headquarters to Corregidor December 25, 1941.

Returned to Philippines with U.S. troops against the Japanese October 20, 1944; appointed General of the Army on December 15, 1944.

Accepted Japanese surrender aboard U.S.S. Missouri September 2, 1945.

During proconsulship in Japan, was appointed Supreme Commander of U.N. forces in the Korean conflict.

Summarily dismissed by President Truman April 10, 1951, for bypassing the Commander in Chief in letters to congressional leaders criticizing American military policy in the Korean war.

HANDS IN YOUR POCKETS

If every taxpayer had to pay an equal share of the Federal expenditures for the fiscal year to February 7, the cost would be \$1,279 each—\$74 more than at this date last year. And if we decided to pay off the

public debt, it would cost each taxpayer \$5,165—\$91 more than at the same time last year. The public debt is now \$309.8 billion, and it takes the total Federal taxes paid from 26 States just to pay the interest.

Congratulations to Mr. Richard Henchey, who is with a Louisville coal company. He discovered that when the specifications were changed for bidding on coal for the local Veterans' Administration Hospital this year that the specifications were written for a lower quality coal with an increased moisture and ash content and for a different size. This inferior quality was going to cost the taxpayers \$9,744 more than the better quality coal when the increased freight and mine charges were added. It was not easy to get the General Services Administration to admit their error, but when they did, the specifications were changed and the taxpayers will save \$9,744.

MAY IS GRADUATION MONTH

Clip the "Creed for Young America" and give to one of the many graduating seniors. As these young adults make their way to the world of tomorrow, this creed will surely symbolize what it means to be an American.

JOB TESTS PENALIZE NEGROES

Because title VII (FEPC section) of the Federal civil rights bill is very similar to the Illinois Fair Employment Practices Commission law, the *Leon Myart v. Motorola*

case has been getting a lot of attention here in Washington. Since 1949, Motorola has hired those who successfully passed a written examination. The test was designed by a professor at the Illinois Institute of Technology, "to help evaluate the trainability of prospective employees." Myart, a 27-year-old Negro, filed a complaint that the 5-minute general ability test discriminated against him. The examiner for the State FEPC ordered Motorola to employ Myart and to stop using the test because it discriminated against "the hitherto culturally deprived and the disadvantaged groups." The examiner said "use of intelligence tests of this sort is a tool serving to discriminate between whites and Negroes, whether done deliberately or not". The final answer as to whether an employer can be permitted to set standards for his employees or whether the State will dictate the standards will probably be decided by the courts. Based on the same reasoning, only last month the New York City Board of Education abolished the use of intelligence tests in the Nation's largest public school system. This was in response to charges that such tests are "middle-class oriented" and are discriminatory primarily against Negroes and Puerto Ricans.

QUESTIONABLE RESULTS

I want to thank you for responding to my questionnaire and know you will be interested in the results.

Questionnaire

	Percent—	
	Yes	No
1. President's budget: This year Congress appropriated a total of \$92,400,000,000. The President recently proposed a budget of \$97,900,000,000, which he indicated would result in a budget deficit of \$4,900,000,000, based upon his estimate of receipts. What should Congress do with this budget?		
(a) Approve the President's recommendation?	25.4	-----
(b) Cut it slightly?	13.8	-----
(c) Cut it heavily?	13.4	-----
(d) Balance the budget?	47.7	-----
2. Foreign-aid program: This year Congress appropriated \$3,000,000,000 for foreign aid.		
(a) Do you favor maintaining the foreign-aid program at present levels?	23.2	76.8
(b) Do you favor eliminating the foreign-aid program entirely?	22.6	77.4
(c) Do you favor a complete revision of the foreign-aid program?	51.7	48.3
(d) Do you favor aid to underdeveloped countries that are pro-Communist?	25.6	74.4
(e) Do you favor a continuation of large-scale aid to South Vietnam?	37.2	62.8
(f) Do you favor the Alliance for Progress for Latin America in its present form?	45.1	54.9
3. Man-on-the-moon project: The space agency contemplates spending \$20,000,000,000 to \$40,000,000,000 between now and 1970 for the man-on-the-moon project.		
(a) Do you favor Congress appropriating money for this project?	49.9	50.1
(b) Do you favor the combined efforts of the United States and Russia for this project?	34.0	66.0
4. Cuba: Do you favor—		
(a) Maintaining the administration's present policies?	27.9	-----
(b) Imposing with our allies a total blockade on Cuba?	36.9	-----
(c) Arm and furnish air cover for Cuban exile invasion?	19.1	-----
(d) The forcible overthrow of the Castro regime by U.S. military forces?	16.1	-----
5. I have introduced H.R. 861 which provides for a constitutional amendment to permit Bible reading and prayer on an optional and nonsectarian basis in public schools. Do you favor such legislation?	90.7	9.3

MORE AID TO COMMUNISTS

I was extremely upset about 2 years ago when I learned that the United States was sending Peace Corp volunteers to help Sukarno in Indonesia. Sukarno had only shortly before said, "I am a Communist of the highest order." A Peace Corp official was reported to have said at that time that we were going to send volunteers "acceptable to Sukarno." "We are not going to send any flag wavers over there, any kids with the Declaration of Independence tattooed on their chests." Sukarno is reported to have recently told U.S. Ambassador Jones that Americans could take their foreign aid and "go to hell with it." All of this seems bad enough, but now we learn that the United States is training Indonesian soldiers to fight against our own friends and allies. There are 280 Indonesian "fighters" in this country being trained not only in police tactics, administration, etc. * * * but also in guerrilla warfare. The State Department has now admitted this to Senator KEATING of New York.

U.S. SALES TO CUBA

Despite the so-called "economic blockade" the United States maintains it has on Cuba, it is very evident that American-made products are being sold to the Latin American country. While State Department officers tour Europe, attempting to argue Western governments into cutting off sales to Cuba, Communist Poland is selling U.S. supplies to Castro. Poland is able to buy strategic materials from us and in turn supply Cuba with the same products under a trade pact agreement. Few of our citizens know that in the last year Poland's central purchasing trust has bought the following items, among others, from the United States, and has sent similar supplies south of our border: Electrical industrial process control instruments, telecommunications apparatus, electronic testing machines, etc. The U.S. Government spends millions trying to counteract Castro's propaganda inside Cuba and to build a fifth column of anti-Communists on that island. This isn't all. The U.S. Department of Commerce has approved the sale of American tex-